

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,396,476 to Bradski et al. (hereinafter Bradski) in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,600 to Thompson et al. (hereinafter Thompson). Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,664,990 to Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates).

The following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bradski in view of Thompson. Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Thompson and in further view of Bates. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 include the limitations “...inventory a **buffered event quantity and a buffered event type** for the **buffered pointing device events...**” and “...provide feedback to the user, the feedback comprising the **buffered event quantity and the buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events and the pointing device events**”

passed to a receiving process.” Claim 1, emphasis added. See also claims 10, 24, 25, and 27.

The Examiner cites Thompson as disclosing “...an apparatus and method for interfacing comprising inventorying the buffered events (see column 3, lines 1-26). Office Action of December 13, 2006 (hereinafter OA061213), page 5, lines 10-11. Thompson does teach inventorying parameters for transaction processing service calls. Thompson, col. 3, lines 6-8. However, the limitation of claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 is for inventorying a **buffered event quantity** and a **buffered event type** for the **buffered pointing device events**. There is no mention in Thompson of inventorying a **buffered event quantity** and a **buffered event type** for the **buffered pointing device events**. Bradski also does not a buffered event quantity and a buffered event type. OA061213, page 2, line 24 – page 3, line 2.

The Examiner further asserts that Thompson “...teaches a number of routines that allows generating a buffered event quantity and buffered event type for the inventories (see column 5, line 43 – column 7, line 54). OA061213, page 5, lines 11-13. Applicants respectfully disagree. A careful review of the CREATE, DELETE, CLEAR, CHECK, TPCALL, POLL routines described in Thompson shows no functionality that allows generating a buffered event quantity and buffered event type for the inventories, nor has the Examiner established a *prima facie* case for the CREATE, DELETE, CLEAR, CHECK, TPCALL, POLL routines providing such functionality. Applicants therefore submit that Thompson does not teach the limitation of the present invention.

Because neither Bradski nor Thompson teach “...inventory a buffered event quantity and a buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events...” and “...provide feedback to the

user, the feedback comprising the buffered event quantity and the buffered event type for the buffered pointing device events and the pointing device events passed to a receiving process...” applicants submit that claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 3-9, 12-14, 17-23, 26, and 30 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Applicants further assert that there is no suggestion to combine synthesizing input events like mouse clicks from external events such as speech as taught by Bradski with the bridge between linear processing based business applications and event-driven based human-computer interfaces taught by Thompson. Bradski, Abstract, Thompson, Abstract. Thompson is directed to a radically different field of endeavor from the pointing field of endeavor of the present invention and Bradski. Thompson is also not concerned with the problem of providing pointing device feedback addressed by the present invention. “In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant’s invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant’s endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned.” *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In addition, the only commonality between Bradski and Thompson is that each includes terms used as limitations in the present invention. Yet it is “impermissible to use the claims as a frame and the prior art references as a mosaic to piece together a facsimile of the claimed invention.” *Uniroyal v. Rudkin-Wiley*, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citing *W. L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc.*, 220 USPQ 303, 312). Because there is no suggestion to combine Bradski and Thompson, Thompson is directed to a different field of endeavor, and that there is

no commonality between Bradski and Thompson except as supplied by the present invention, applicants submit that claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, 17-27, and 30 are allowable.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1, 3-10, 12-14, 17-27, and 30 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler

Reg. No. 38,527

Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 13, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929